APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,158	07/16/2003	Sathyanarayanan N. Kavacheri	SUN-P030090	1910

32615   7590   04/30/2007
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
DAO, THUY CHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/622,158	KAVACHERI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuy Dao	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 February 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8-14</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,15-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 July 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/19/07</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on February 1, 2007.

2. Claims 1-7 and 15-28 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. Per Applicants' request, claims 15-23 have been amended, claims 8-14 have been canceled, and claims 24-28 have been added.

4. The objection to the specification is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.

5. The 35 USC §101 rejection over claims 15-23 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.

Response to Arguments

6. The Applicants are thanked for a thorough reply. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered. However, they are not persuasive.

    a) The limitations "_create a node_ for said wireless client device _in a software directory_..." (Remarks, page 8, lines 1-7, emphasis added).

In the specification, page 15, lines 18-20, the Applicants specifically defined:

> "_LDAP directories, schema, subschema and DITs are terms known_
>
> _in the art. As an overview, an LDAP directory or database_
>
> _includes a number of individual nodes (e.g., records, objects or_
>
> _entries) ..._ " (emphasis added).

Per this definition (i.e., nodes as objects) and as set forth in the previous Office Action mailed November 1, 2006, iPlanet Portal Server explicitly discloses:

    create a node for said wireless client device (e.g., page 16, section "Client Data Objects" wherein Client Data Objects are nodes, and the Mobile Access Pack server provides Client Data Objects for HTML, cHTML clients, also in page 16, lines 16-19)

    [said node] in a software directory (e.g., section "Introduction" (page 15), Client Data Objects in iPlanet Portal Server (page 16), iPlanet Directory Server (page

15, lines 15-17), and module Client Detection (page 16, lines 17-19), wherein "... the server's Client Detection module examines the HTTP request of the client and matches it against the <u>server's Client Data objects</u> (page 245, lines 14-18, i.e., <u>Client Data objects stored in server software directory</u>, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

b) The limitations *"said information for said wireless client device is stored in other than said XML form"* (Remarks, page: 12 – page 9: 8, emphasis added).

Again, as set forth in the previous Office Action, iPlanet Portal Server explicitly discloses *"...other than said XML form"*:

page 245, Client Data Objects as Java objects (other than said XML form);

page 280, using method `getProperty()` to retrieve data/properties from a Client Data Object, specifically in line 22 `"Client clientObj = null"`, which indicates `"clientObj"` is an instance of class `"Client"`; and

page 279, section Using the Client API, specifically lines 16-21:

```
Class Client
java.lang.Object
    |
   +--java.util.Observable
          |
         +--com.iplanet.portalserver.client.Client
```

Accordingly, Applicants' arguments are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully maintains the 35 USC §102 rejection over old claims 1-7 and 15-23.

c) Newly added claims 24-28 with firstly presented limitations *"...an LDAP subschema configured to: create a node ... and create a Directory Information Tree (DIT)..."* necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action (emphasis added).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-7 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by iPlanet Portal Server (art of record, "Programmer's Guide – iPlanet Portal Server: Mobile Access Pack", Sun Microsystems, Inc., published in November 2001).

Claim 1:

iPlanet Portal Server discloses a computer-usable storage medium and *a method of storing client device profiles on a server, said method comprising:*

accessing information that identifies properties of a wireless client device, wherein said information is received in Extensible Markup Language (XML) form (e.g., pp. 257-259, section "Configuring the Attributes", configuring attributes in a component XML file such as <component_name>.xml or iwtClient.xml);

creating a node for said wireless client device in a software directory resident on said server (e.g., page 16, section "Client Data Objects"; page 245); *and*

storing said information identifying properties of said wireless client device as attributes of said node in said software directory (e.g., pp. 15-16, section "Introduction", iPlanet Portal Server and iPlanet Directory Server; page 245: 14-18),

wherein said information for said wireless client device is stored in other than said XML form (e.g., page 245, Client Data Objects as Java.TM. objects; page 280, using method getProperty() to retrieve data/properties from the Data Objects; page 279: 16-21).

Claim 2:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *said server is a portal server* (e.g., pp. 15-16, section "Introduction", iPlanet Portal Server).

Claim 3:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *said server is a directory server coupled to a portal server* (e.g., pp. 15-16, section "Introduction", iPlanet Portal Server and iPlanet Directory Server),.

Claim 4:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *said software directory comprises a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory comprising a node for each of a plurality of wireless client devices, wherein an LDAP Directory Information Tree (DIT) is created for each of said wireless client devices* (e.g., page 21: 1-12; page 221, last section).

Claim 5:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *parsing said information received in said XML form prior to said creating and storing* (e.g., page 259: 10-18).

Claim 6:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *fetching an attribute from said software directory* (e.g., page 254, fetching the client type from the Session, Client Instance, or Client property userAgent).

Claim 7:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *modifying an attribute in said software directory* (e.g., pp. 257-259, modifying existing component attributes and adding new attributes to a component).

Claims 15-21:

Claims 15-21 are computer-useable storage medium versions, which recite the same limitations as those of claims 1-7, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claims, it also teaches all of the limitations of claims 15-21.

Claim 22:

The rejection of base claim 15 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *said information is received from a data base resident on said computer system* (e.g., page 245, database of Client Data Objects stored in server).

Claim 23:

The rejection of base claim 15 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *said information is received from another device in communication with said computer system* (e.g., page 245, client devices contacting server and sending information in the client's HTTP header).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over iPlanet Portal Server in view of "Appendix C BuyerXpert/SellerXpert Mapping to LDAP" to Sun Microsystems, Inc., September 2001 (art made of record, hereinafter "Appendix C").

Claim 24 (new):

iPlanet Portal Server discloses *a system for storing client device profiles, comprising:*

a server configured to access properties of a wireless client device (e.g., page 15, section Introduction; page 16, iPlanet Portal Server; page 15: 15-17, iPlanet Directory Server),

wherein said properties are received in Extensible Markup Language (XML) form (e.g., pp. 257-259), *and*

wherein said server comprises a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) software directory (e.g., page 21: 1-12; page 221, last section); *and*

create a node in the LDAP software directory for said wireless client device and store said properties as attributes of the node (e.g., page 16, nodes as Client Data Objects; page 245: 14-18, Client Data Objects stored in server software directory),

wherein said properties are stored in other than said XML form (e.g., page 245, Client Data Objects as Java objects; pp. 279-280, `clientojb` is an instance of class `Client`).

iPlanet Portal Server does not explicitly disclose *an LDAP subschema configured to create a node in the LDAP software directory and create a Directory Information Tree DIT for said node.*

However, in an analogous art, Appendix C further discloses:

an LDAP subschema (e.g., page 3: 9 – page 10: 6; page 1: 22-24) *configured to*

create a node in the LDAP software directory (e.g., page 1: 13-24; page 6, sample entries in Organizational Unit Mapping and User Mapping) *and*

create a Directory Information Tree DIT for said node (e.g., page 2, FIG. C-1, LDAP DIT structure and related text).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Appendix C's teaching into iPlanet Portal

Server's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to provide standard object classes and allow applications to extend the schema for application-specific support as well as create entries in the LDAP repository in accordance with a directory structure and schema as suggested by Appendix C (e.g., page 3: 9-14; page 1: 22-24).

Claim 25 (new):

The rejection of claim 24 is incorporated. Appendix C further discloses *said properties are stored as an instance of the LDAP subschema* (e.g., page 3: 9-14).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Appendix C's teaching into iPlanet Portal Server's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 24 above.

Claim 26 (new):

The rejection of claim 24 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *said properties comprise a screen size of the wireless client device, a memory capacity of the wireless client device, and a keyboard capability of the wireless client device* (e.g. pp. 26-32, Desktop and Mobile Devices Home Page Template Files).

Claim 27 (new):

The rejection of claim 24 is incorporated. iPlanet Portal Server also discloses *said attributes are name-value pairs* (e.g. page 89, section Tag Attribute Evaluation).

Claim 28 (new):

The rejection of claim 24 is incorporated. Appendix C further discloses *said DIT provides a naming hierarchy for naming said node in said LDAP software directory* (e.g., page 2, FIG. C-1, LDAP DIT structure and related text).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Appendix C's teaching into iPlanet Portal

Server's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 24 above.

Conclusion

11. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone is (571) 272 8570. The examiner can normally be reached on the first Monday of the bi-week, and every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Dao

WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER